

Contract Improvement Process
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2006

Attendees:	Keith Nordell	CDOC
	Sandy Hicks	CU
	Monica Rahman	DHS
	Lisa Eze	CDLE
	Sue Griswold	DNR
	Kay Kishline	SPO
	Les Shenefelt	SCO
	Maggie Leiman	CDPHE
	Joi Simpson	DA/DHR
	Linda Shubow	AG
	Michelle Lee	CDHS
	Harry McCabe	CDHS
	Clark Bolser	DPA/REP
	Lisa Ellis	CDPHE
	Jeff Warren	CDPS
	Bob Jaros	SCO

Agenda

1. Update on Working Committee
2. Risk Assessment
3. Delegation
4. Higher Education
5. Contract Tools
6. Contracts Database
7. Contracts Monitoring
8. Subcommittees
9. Next Steps

Steering Committee Comments

Risk Assessment

- All contracts will have a risk assessment except for those in certain categories
- Dollar amount should be one of the factors, not an overriding factor as it is today
- Consider a very high dollar threshold as an overriding factor
- May have different dollar amounts for different agencies, but balance this with the need for a straightforward model – try to avoid complexity
- Should SCO do a risk assessment for the agencies, and vary SCO/AG review based on the risk categorization of the agency?
- For risk factors, take out “Contactor in sound financial condition and no risk of non-performance”

- Add risk factor for “complexity”
- Consider a weighing of factors
- Zero dollar leases should be reviewed due to obligating the state
- For contracts the SCO reviews, the AG also does not need to review them. How would this work in our proposed model? Should we have different criteria for AG and SCO review?
- Goal should be to reduce SCO and AG review without increasing the risk to the state
- Balance between protecting state and administrative hardship of processing contracts
- AG review should be consistent, and not vary depending on which AG reviews the contract
- Contracts that are out of agency’s expertise should have a SCO/AG review

Delegation

- Training critical with delegation
- Meet with agency that does not perform up to expectations and set clear performance standards and timing to achieve those standards
- Peer reviews

Higher Ed

- Agreed that Higher Ed is different
- Agreed that we need a dialog with Higher Ed

Contract Tools

- Agreed with working committee’s approach

Contracts Database

- Review DPA’s database
- Wait for legislation

Contracts Monitoring

- Management responsibility
- No central guidelines
- Discussed potential of sharing best practices for monitoring at agencies. Is this something the working committee can do?

Subcommittees

- Agreed with working committee’s approach

Next Steps

- How do we implement such a large change in approach?
- Consider pilot agencies